Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

PAMELA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

GYRUS ACMI, LP, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-00805 BLF (HRL)

ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE REPORT NO. 5

Re: Dkt. 162

In Discovery Dispute Report 5, defendant Gyrus ACMI, LP (GALP) seeks an order requiring plaintiff Pamela Williams to respond to its fourth and fifth sets of interrogatories (i.e., Interrogatories 20-21) without objection. Defendant also points out that plaintiff failed to timely respond to its related third and fourth sets of requests for admission (RFAs). But, defendant does not seek an order compelling plaintiff to respond to those RFAs because GALP contends that the matters stated in those RFAs have been deemed admitted.

As has become the practice in this case, Discovery Dispute Report 5 was unilaterally filed by defendant, followed by a separate opposition from plaintiff, despite the undersigned's Standing Order re Civil Discovery Disputes requiring a joint discovery report. Defendant says that it was not for lack of trying. GALP says it scheduled the requisite in-person meet-and-confer for October 19, 10:30 a.m. at the Hilton San Francisco Union Square Hotel, 333 O'Farrell Street in San Francisco---a date, time, and place agreed to by plaintiff. Defense counsel says she flew to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

San Francisco, stayed overnight, and waited at the appointed time and place for an hour, but plaintiff never showed. Plaintiff does not dispute defendant's version of events.

As for the interrogatories in question: If a party fails to timely respond to discovery requests, any objections she might have asserted are waived. See Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992) ("It is well established that a failure to object to discovery requests within the time required constitutes a waiver of any objection."); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4) ("The grounds for objecting to an interrogatory must be stated with specificity. Any ground not stated in a timely objection is waived unless the court, for good cause, excuses the failure.").

In her opposition papers, filed on October 31, 2016, plaintiff states that she "has complied with all of the discovery requests from Defendants." (Dkt. 176). That cursory assertion, however, says nothing about whether plaintiff, in fact, timely responded to the interrogatories in question. Nor does it aid this court's analysis in determining whether there is good cause to excuse the failure to timely respond. Plaintiff otherwise argues that defendants failed to cooperate in the preparation of a joint case management statement prior to a conference before Judge Freeman. She also complains that defendants have not returned documents that she says are privileged. This court declines to address these latter two arguments because they are irrelevant to the matters at hand in the present discovery dispute report.

Even so, defendant having correctly taken the position that the matters in the related third and fourth sets of RFAs are deemed admitted, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3), this court sees no need to require plaintiff to answer the subject interrogatories, which seem to require an answer only if the related RFAs are "not unqualifiedly admitted." (Dkt. 162-1, Ex. B at 10 and Ex. D at 33). Accordingly, defendant's request for an order compelling responses to their fourth and fifth sets of interrogatories is denied as moot.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 1, 2016

ARD R. L UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

United States District Court Northern District of California	1	5:14-cv-00805-BLF Notice has been electronically mailed to:
	2	Glenn Lansing Briggs gbriggs@kadingbriggs.com, vbeechler@kadingbriggs.com
	3	
	4	Kymberleigh Damron-Hsiao kdh@kadingbriggs.com, mrogers@kadingbriggs.com, smohammadi@kadingbriggs.com, vbeechler@kadingbriggs.com
	5	Pamela Williams Pam.Williams1001@gmail.com
	6	
	7	5:14-cv-00805-BLF Notice sent by U.S. Mail to:
	8	Pamela Williams 909 Marina Village Parkway #292
	9	Alameda, CA 94501
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	